

Serial No.: 10/500,733

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to the figure. This sheet, which includes the single figure, replaces the original sheet of the figure. The air conditioning arrangement 31 has been represented in the amended figure.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this Patent Application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks. No additional fee is required for this Amendment as the number of independent claims has not changed, and the total number of claims has decreased.

Request for Telephone Interview

Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned at (847) 490-1400 to schedule a telephone interview, to discuss the merits of this Patent Application.

Amendment to the Drawings

Applicants amended the figure to represent the recited air conditioning arrangement. Support for this Amendment can be found at page 7, last paragraph, of Applicants' Substitute Specification. No new matter has been added to the Patent Application by the amended figure.

Amendment to the Specification

Applicants amended the Specification to provide a reference number for the air conditioning arrangement shown in the amended figure. No new matter has been added to the Specification by this Amendment.

Amendment to the Claims

Applicants amended Claim 1 to include limitations of dependent Claims 2-5. Claims 2-5 and 8-12 have been canceled in view of amended Claim 1. Applicants added new Claim 13. Support for this Amendment can be found at page 7, last paragraph, of Applicants' Substitute Specification. No new matter has been added to the claims by this Amendment.

Drawing Objections

The drawing has been rejected for not showing every feature of the invention recited in the claims.

Regarding the "air conditioning arrangement," Applicants amended the figure to show a representation of an air conditioning arrangement according to an embodiment of this invention.

Regarding “the profiled leg formed as an extruded profiled section,” beyond what is shown in the figure, Applicants are unsure how the Examiner wants the inflow line (22) and the outflow line (26) shown as being extruded. Applicants would appreciate the Examiner contacting the undersigned by telephone to discuss this objection further, for clarification.

Regarding the “support frame with vertical profiled sections,” Applicants request reconsideration that one skilled in the art would readily appreciate the meaning of this limitation in view of Applicants disclosure, and that a more detailed rendition of these features is not needed to support or enable the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, for the reasons set forth at page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants amended the figure as discussed above. Applicants respectfully assert the claims are not vague and indefinite, and that drawing objections do not necessarily render claims vague and indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Applicants believe that the above Amendment and comments overcome the rejection of Claims 1-12.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsala, U.S. Patent 6,519,955, in view of Lopez, U.S. Patent 5,509,468, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent Claims 2-5. Claim 1 now recites “a governor (30) integrated into one of the component inlet line (27) and the component outflow line (23) for controlling an amount of the coolant conducted to the built-in electrical components (11).” The Office Action notes that the Marsala Patent does not teach or suggest a “flow rate control,” and cites the Lopez Patent for teaching flow rate control 296. The Office Action alleges it would have been obvious to use the flow rate control of the Lopez Patent for adjusting the cooling requirement in the device of the Marsala Patent.

However, combining the teachings of the prior art references, and applying the flow rate control of the Lopez Patent to the system of the Marsala Patent, does not provide Applicants’ claimed invention. The Lopez Patent discloses one flow rate control 296 for the entire fluid manifold 26 and for all of the hard disks 98 in assembly 20. The flow rate control 296 is positioned between the fluid receptacle 76, e.g., the air conditioner, and the fluid manifold 26 (*See FIG. 6*). Applicants’ invention

of Claim 1 recites that the governor is integrated into one of the component inlet line (27) and the component outflow line (23), not between the air conditioning arrangement and the inflow or outflow lines (as in the Lopez Patent).

Neither the Lopez Patent nor the Marsala Patent, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests a governor integrated into one of the electrical component inlet line and the electrical component outflow line, as in Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, the combination of the Lopez Patent nor the Marsala Patent does not provide every claim limitation of amended Claim 1. The Office Action does not put forth a proper *prima facie* case of obvious with respect to at least the limitations of dependent Claim 5, which have now been incorporated into Claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Regarding new Claim 13, the Marsala Patent discloses using a refrigerant, such as R-134a, and does not disclose using water. Also, the Office Action states Applicants' recited ventilating device is obvious because ventilating devices are known. However, the Office Action does not explain how it is obvious to use the allegedly known ventilating device in the R-134a system of the Marsala Patent.

Serial No.: 10/500,733

Applicants respectfully assert that all claims are in condition for allowance in view of the above Amendment and remarks.

Conclusion

Applicants intend to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicants have not resolved in this response, Applicants' undersigned attorney again requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Applicants sincerely believe that this Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and, thus, respectfully request early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark D. Swanson
Regis. No. 48,498

Pauley Petersen & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road
Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195
(847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403